Point of Order: re. Disallowance of cut motions under S. O. 56.

Mr. K. T. Mathew.—On a point of order, Sir, I have to bring to the attention of the President a very serious matter, viz. the powers that we the members of the Council have, are being usurped by others. The matter is that a motion was disallowed under section 56, Standing Order. This Standing Order empowers only the members of this Council to bring to the notice of the President or the Council, that notice requiring a limited time is not complied with. It does not empower anyone else to say that this requirement has not been complied with. Standing Order 56 reads:—

"If notice of a motion to omit or reduce any grant has not been given five clear days before the day on which the demand is to be considered any member may object to the moving of the motion and such objection shall prevail unless the President in the exercise of his power to suspend the rule allows the motion to be made",

That is the point. Only a member in this Council has got the right of bringing to the attention of the President that the rule about notice is not complied with. Neither the President nor his office, nor any Government officer who is not a member of the Council, has got the right of making use of this section.

Mr. M. A. Chakko.—I think the Government Member is also a member of the Council.

Mr. K. T. Mathew.—Government officials as members of the Council have got that right, but not merely because they are Government officers.

Mr. C. J. Mathew.—It has been the long continued practice of this House to disallow cut motions received late. Five days' clear notice is always insisted upon, but sometimes motions are admitted with shorter notice as a matter of concession.

Mr. K. T. Mathew.—We don't want any concession from the Government. We insist on our rights. The motion has been disallowed under the section that I referred to.

The Council Secretary as a Member of this House has got that right, but not as the Secretary of the Council. He did not raise any objection in the Council against admitting the motion given notice of.

Mr. C. J. Mathew.—The procedure generally observed is to disallow all cut motions received short of 5 days' notice. They are then considered late and they are rejected as a matter of course. President sometimes waives this rule in special cases. That is all.

Mr. K. T. Mathew.—Sir, I am raising a point of order about a motion being disallowed under S. O. 56. I am not bringing to the consideration of the President any other section,

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

I say that disallowing a motion under S. O. 56 without placing the motion before the Council is quite out of order. It is usurping the powers of the Council members, if any motion be disallowed under that S. O. before placing the motion before the Council.

Mr. A. Sankara Poduval.—Standing Order 56 applies to matters in the Council. I request the President that a considered ruling may be given, because it is a vital matter affecting our rights.

President.—Do you press for a ruling on that?

Mr. K. T. Mathew.—Yes. What is the use of our coming here if our powers be permitted to be usurped by others? It is a matter about which an adjournment motion should be moved. I want a ruling.

President.—After mature consideration, I shall give a ruling to-morrow.

Demands for Grants.

1. 1—Land Revenue—Rs. 2,66,760 (*contd.*)

Motion No. 2 (*contd.*).

President —Yesterday when we adjourned, we were discussing cut motion No. 2 under Land Revenue moved by Mr. Ikkanda Warriar, and Dr. A. R. Menon, the Hon'ble Member for Cheruviruthi, was speaking on the subject. He may continue if he wishes to say anything more.

Dr. A. R. Menon.— Sir, yesterday I have been saying when I stopped the speech that the Finance Minister, drawing himself to his full stature, was proclaiming to this House the great sacrifice that the officers have undergone in bringing a surplus budget. But what is the truth? The truth is that 90 per cent of the people are living upon 40 per cent—putting it at a high estimate—of their former income and the Government officials have sacrificed only 10 per cent. Did it ever occur to you, gentlemen, that it would be far far better, as men of honour and as men of propriety, that you should sacrifice your 10 per cent rather than that you should stand in the way of a further reduction, so far as 90 per cent are concerned? Is it not your duty to look after these people who are entrusted to your charge before you help yourselves? Now, perhaps you may not have even viewed this matter in that light. I shall not proceed further with that topic.

But I shall just take the declaration of the Secretary who has a horror of having an unbalanced budget. I remember very well when I put that proposition that even if the budget is not balanced by one or half a lakh of rupees, this State will not come down like a house of cards. He won't accept that. He

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly